REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of September 8, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 18 and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 19, 20, 22, 28 and 35 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-17, 19-25 and 27-35 remain pending in this application after entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 12, 20, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ran *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,026, hereinafter "Ran"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 12, 20, and 28 relate to, *inter alia*, determining whether information or data values have changed by identifying one or more differences between information currently received from a content provider and prior or previously stored information. Contrary to the Office Action's assertions, Ran lacks any teaching or suggestion of such a feature. The Office Action asserts that Ran teaches "the content server determining if any of the at least one portion of the information has changed, by identifying one or more differences between the at least one portion of the information and prior information previously stored in the data store of the content server (col. 12, lines 17-51, the warning identifies information that has changed)." pp. 2-3, ¶ 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. At best, Ran discloses processing real-time traveler information and sending back a processed personalized abnormal real-time travel condition warning. Col. 12, ll. 17-51. However, Ran does not teach or suggest how the information is processed, much less determining whether information or data values have changed by identifying one or more differences *between information currently received from a content provider and prior or previously stored information.* Notably, Ran merely discloses processing the *current* real-time traveler information (i.e., not previous traveler information) and determining whether a warning is warranted. As such, not only does Ran lack any teaching or suggestion of identifying differences between current information and prior or previously stored

information, as is recited in claims 1, 12, 20 and 28, there would also be no need or desire to have such a feature in Ran.

In response to Applicants arguments presented in the Amendment dated July 31, 2006, the Office Action asserts that "the claim language is not directed specifically towards personalized information." p. 12-13, ¶ 35. Applicants note that their arguments are not directed toward the concept of personalized information. Applicants were merely using the analogy presented by the Office Action (without acquiescence thereto) in discussing the deficiencies of Ran. Claims 1, 12, 20 and 28 are thus allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2 and 29 are dependent on claims 1 and 28 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 4, 13, 15-17, 21, 23-25, 30 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran in view of Kondou _et al._ (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,075, hereinafter "Kondou"). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran in view of Kondou and in further view of Tyra _et al._ (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,565, hereinafter "Tyra"). Claims 6-11, 14, 18, 19, 22, 26, 27 and 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran in view of Kondou and in further view of De Boor _et al._ (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,316, hereinafter "De Boor"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claim 35 recites, _inter alia_, "the real-time data server module performs a method including a) querying the keyed hash table for corresponding data; b) determining whether the queried data differs from data previously sent to the remote mobile terminal; and c) when the queried data differs from the data previously sent to the remote mobile terminal, the queried data is sent to the remote mobile terminal, otherwise the queried data is not sent to the remote mobile terminal." Nowhere does Ran or Kondou teach or suggest such a feature. As previously discussed, Ran is directed to a method of processing real-time traveler information and providing personalized warnings based on the real-time traveler information. Col. 12, ll. 17-51. Ran lacks any teaching or suggestion of determining whether queried data differs from data

previously sent to a mobile terminal, as is recited in claim 35. Specifically, Ran does not teach or suggest that the real-time traveler information (i.e., alleged queried data) is compared to data previously sent to the remote mobile terminal.

Kondou fails to cure this deficiency. Kondou generally discloses a method and system for providing desired information immediately to a mobile terminal. Abstract. Kondou further discloses receiving positional information from a mobile terminal and determining whether current positional information of a mobile terminal coincides with previous positional information of the same mobile terminal. If the current positional information of the mobile terminal coincides with the previous positional information of the same mobile terminal, the server shifts it operation to interruption of the connection without retrieving information on the situation, and the information server does not send situation information to the mobile terminal. If the current positional information does not coincide with the previous positional information, the information server downloads the situational information. Col. 7, ll. 28-56. However, such a method still does not constitute determining whether queried data differs from data *previously sent to the remote mobile terminal*. Thus, claim 35 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 3-11, 13-19, 21-27 and 30-34 are dependent on their respective independent claims and thus, incorporate all of the features of their respective independent claims. Independent claims 1, 12, 20 and 28, as stated above, relate to determining whether information or data values have changed by identifying one or more differences between information currently received from a content provider and prior or previously stored information. Further, changed information, but not unchanged information, is transmitted to a user terminal. As discussed previously, Ran lacks any teaching or suggestion of identifying one or more differences between information currently received from a content provider and prior or previously stored information. None of the cited secondary references, Kondou, De Boor or Tyra, cures this deficiency (e.g., see discussion of Kondou above). Claims 1, 12, 20 and 28 are thus allowable for at least these reasons.

In addition, dependent claims 3-11, 13-17, 19, 21-25, 27 and 30-34 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 8, 2007   By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
                                                      Chunhsi Andy Mu
                                                      Registration No. 58,216

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001